DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 241 920 CS 207 769

AUTHOR Altschull, J. Herbert
TITLE The Origins of Journalism Education: A Cross-National Perspective.
PUB DATE 7 Aug 83
NOTE 23p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Association for Education in Journalism and Mass Communication (66th, Corvallis, OR, August 6-9, 1983).
PUB TYPE Historical Materials (060) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Communications; Developed Nations; Developing Nations; Educational Development; *Global Approach; Government Role; *International Relations; *Journalism Education; Mass Media; *News Media; Newspapers; *Political Influences; *Socioeconomic Influences; Television; United States History; Values
IDENTIFIERS *Journalism History; Media Role

ABSTRACT

Differences in journalism education across the world reflect differences in political, economic, and social environments. Journalism education in the United States, which began in the age of progressivism and reflected the values of the time, has emphasized the press's objectivity and independence, an independence built on its reliance on advertising rather than on political or governmental funding. The stress on practical training so evident in U. S. journalism schools is only beginning to be found in Western Europe, largely because of European papers' traditional concern with political ideology. Reflecting Leninist principles and supported by the government or the Communist Party, the Soviet press seeks to inform, teach, and motivate others to action. Due to its training courses and its reputation for unbiased reporting, the British Broadcasting Corporation (BBC) has had a lasting influence on journalism education in Asia and Africa. The United States has provided Third World nations with a model for journalism education and has impressed students from those countries with the technical quality of its broadcasting. Advancing nations protest, however, against the cultural penetration of western programing. Unwilling to be influenced simply by American or Soviet beliefs, Third World countries endorse objectivity, fairness, and balance in journalism, yet see the press as a partner with the government in organizing public thinking. (MM)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

THE ORIGINS OF JOURNALISM EDUCATION: A CROSS-NATIONAL PERSPECTIVE

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

by

ED241920

J. Herbert Altschull

Indiana University

Presented to the History and Qualitative Studies Divisions, Association for Education in Journalism convention, Corvallis, Oregon, August 7, 1983

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

J. Herbert Altschull

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

CS207469

While journalism education did not begin in the United States, it was in the special political and economic climate of the United States that it rose and flourished, and from where it has been exported to all parts of the world. Elsewhere, however, the direction of journalism education has been different from that in the United States, again owing mainly to the differences in political and economic and indeed social environments.

Which is better? Which pattern is of greater service to humankind, the journalistic or the general variety? Your answer to that question will rest, as does the answer to most quuestions, on the world view from which you start.

In the United States, schools of journalism appeared as the ideas of progressivism -- and even populism -- were at their zenith in the United States, especially in the Midwest, where the movement for journalism schools began. The Whig interpretation of history was universal: Every day and in every way, things were getting better. While capitalism was good, certainly morally superior to the oligarchies of nineteenth century Europe and to the communism of Soviet Russia, nevertheless there was room for improvement and progress. And the press marched in the vanguard of the preachers of improvement and progress; the muckrakers were the heroes, and the code of the watchdog was holy writ. Thus, the students who emerged from the schools of journalism were automatically tub-thumpers for progress and

watchdoggery. They also championed the financing of newspapers and magazines by advertisers and not by government: the advertisers were seen as disinterested in political issues and unlikely to seek to exercise control over content. And if advertisers ever tried to do so, they were to be spanked sharply and reminded of who ran the paper and what the mission of the press was. The ideas of Will Irwin and his colleagues were well known, but the standard was to keep the advertiser and the business manager in the boardroom, not in the news room. It was a standard given clear expression by no less a figure than Joseph Pulitzer, the patron saint of schools of journalism.

Within these schools, the excesses of the sensational tabloids that had sprung into prominence came under sharp attack. Serious journalists, those who would graduate from the schools, were to eschew the sensational and to practice instead the code of objectivity, which was seen as the appropriate counter to the sensational tabloids. Fallen newspapers were in the age of Henry Ford's flivver, practicing what was called ``jazz journalism.'' The graduates would counter the excesses of sensationalism and follow the model of Pulitzer, who promoted truth and accuracy (at least in his later years) above sensation and profit. This was also the period in which news agencies (or wire services, as they were called) were attaining greater prominence and were preaching a form of political fence-sitting in the name of objectivity.

This then was the belief system of the schools of journalism: that unlimited years of progress lay ahead for the United States and its politico-economic system, that the press played a leadership role in bringing about that glorious future, that the financial structure of the American press assured economic health and political independence for newspapers -- and that this healthy future could be insured best of all by following the path of objectivity. In the early years of

journalism education, the newspaper industry itself was of mixed opinion about the wisdom of such training at institutions of higher learning. Some editors liked to recruit their staffs from the journalism schools, but more were suspicious of college-trained reporters. Many editors tended to prefer those who had studied, as the saying went, ``in the school of hard knocks,'' drawing on experience over education. The model reporter was Hildy Johnson, the hero of Ben Hecht's stage classic, THE FRONT PAGE, a figure who appeared in hundreds of motion pictures and novels, the hard-drinking, hard-loving cynic with a heart of gold, the ink-stained cousin of the range heroes of the Wild West. Book-learning was suspect to these heroes and their followers.

Still, with the passage of time, more and more publishers came around to recruiting their staffs from schools of journalism. Whatever the appeal of tradition and the resistance to book-learning, the publishers were unable to resist the economic advantages available to them in the journalism schools. These advantages were significant; by recruiting staffs from the journalism schools, publishers could eliminate the considerable cost of on-the-job training. They could -- and did -- demand college and university graduates who not only were skilled in writing and reportorial techniques, but who also knew how to write headlines, who understood the principles of advertising and subscription sales, and who were already socialized into the belief systems of the publishers themselves. Who could resist such a financial bonanza? Here were staffs trained for the most part at public expense, reporters who could be relied upon to accept -- and indeed seek to advance -- the political, social, and economic environment in which they operated. It was the best possible mechanism of social control -- adherence to the familiar, cost-effective status quo, and at virtually no cost. It was the taxpayer who footed the bill

for this education, since the leading schools of journalism were situated at state colleges and universities that were supported by public funding. At the private colleges and universities, the expense was borne by students or their families in the form of tuition or endowment funds. In neither case was the cost paid by the press industry. In recent years, many newspapers and broadcasting outlets have reduced their costs even further through internship programs, often without salaries for the student interns, who are compensated instead by academic credit.

Although schools of journalism in the United States are essentially training grounds in the capitalist ideology of the press, the news media are frequently subjected to critical examination in classrooms and in research projects. Students are regularly assigned to evaluate press performance, often to examine whether or not a newspaper -- or especially a television news outlet -- has lived up to the ideological expectations of the student or professor. This practice is not universally applauded by media officials, who argue that journalism schools ought to concentrate on training students in newswriting and editing skills. Press theorists of a conservative bent tend to follow the lead of critics such as Spiro Agnew, the former vice-president, who in 1969 stirred the wrath of the press community by attacking the leadng national dailies, THE NEW YORK TIMES and THE WASHINGTON POST, and the three TV networks, arguing that the journalists who worked for those news media were members of an eastern, liberal establishment whose views did not represent those of Middle America.

In the tradition of Agnew, a group of conservative publications in 1977 set up in Washington a National Journalism Center training program for student interns ``within a context of traditional values.'' According to conservative columnist M. Stanton Evans, director of the

center, ``too many journalists have been taught that capitalism is evil or that America is imperialist and that journalism should be used as a method of advancing political ideas.'' For some media critics in the United States, the traditional educative role of the journalism schools is not conservative or traditional enough. Dispassionate observers would be astonished to hear that. Conventions and meetings of journalism professors and graudate students devote themselves, to a remarkable extent, to programs and research within a framework of preserving and strengthening the belief system that includes devotion

to the principle of objectivity and to traditional press values. (eop)

The school of journalism that emphasizes practical training is an American invention; it has not established a strong foothold in other nations with market economies, although the practice may be changing. In Western Europe, little support has been evidenced for programs in journalism practice at institutions of higher learning. Faculties have resisted the idea, and publishers have not demonstrated interest in having anyone else train their staffs of writers and editors. The difference on the two sides of the Atlantic can be attributed in large measure to the difference in the political structure of the press. In the United States where advertising revenues long represented the chief financial support of the press, political ``independence'' was early seen as a virtue. Advertisers are less likely to publish their notices in press vehicles that represent opposing political viewpoints; hence, political independence helps in maximizing advertising income. In Europe, the newspaper has retained a stance of political partiality to a far greater degree; on the continent of Europe, the news media have traditionally adopted open political stands, often serving as outright instruments of political parties. These organs were less interested in maximizing advertising revenue than in political persuasion. The

publishers, in these cases, sought to recruit staff members whose politics they shared, rather than those who possessed the skills of writing, editing, layout design, and headline writing. These could be taught on the job. In Great Britian, as in France and Germany, publishers have long been inclined to recruit staff members from university programs in economics, politics, or even in Latin and Greek. Few European universities publish student newspapers; Oxford students are among those who have proposed their own paper for years. The American influence has been greater in Latin America and the Far East than in Europe, and a number of university journalism programs have developed in South America, Taiwan, and Korea; an increasing number is appearing also in Africa and the Middle East, but in all these cases, training is more likely to stress journalism history and philosophy, theory and methodology, rather than the practical skills.

In recent years, the European press seems to have adopted not only the American journalistic mystique embodied in the First Amendment but the American press style as well, with its emphasis on short paragraphs and sentences, on sharp, conflict-ridden phrasing -- and even its method of training journalists. The pace of adoption of American style and training has been slow, but there has been movement, both ideological and pedagogical, flowing from west to east. Party-oriented newspapers are giving way to a press ostensibly ``objective'' and free of partisan posturing.

While schools of journalism in the United States do not transmit social and ideological orthodoxy in courss specifically devoted to political and economic ``truth,'' such is not the case in the Soviet Union, where the principles of Marxism-Leninism are central in the training of journalists. In addition, students at the 23 journalism schools in the Soviet Union learn the tool skills and fundamentals of the social science and humanities. The enrollment at the largest of

the schools, the Moscow State University School of Journalism, totals 2,500 on a regular basis, divided about equally between those who concentrate on preparation as a domestic correspondent and those who study to become a foreign correspondent. Those who opt for foreign correspondence -- and the majority of students put in for the foreign division, for they are then in a position to do something most Soviet citizens cannot do, that is, to travel extensively abroad. Their training program is tough, for they must choose a particular assignment, say Turkey, or francophone Africa, and then study not only the languages needed but also the history, culture and belief systems of the designated area. Thus, Soviet journalists assigned to the United States almost always know more of American history and law than their American counterparts.

Marx is celebrated in the communist world as the father of Marxist journalism but in fact Marx's views on the press are entirely unacceptable in the Soviet Union today. It is the teachings of Lenin that are applied, and Lenin was quite specific about the role the press must play. Soviet schools of journalism and indeed those in Eastern Europe train their students explicitly to cover the ``news'' by applying to their coverage the three roles Lenin assigned to the press. Only thus, Soviet journalism students are instructed, can there be a truly ``objective'' press.

Lenin's goals were not original: he himself credited them to the German socialist leader, Wilhelm Liebknecht. ``Studieren, propagandieren, organisieren,'' Liebknecht demanded of a press organ that would serve socialist revolutionaries -- ``Learn, propagandize, organize.'' Looked at carefully, a remarkable similarity can be detected between the goal models of such disparate figures as Horace Greeley and V. I. Lenin.

Studieren -- to learn -- is closely associated with the verb ``to

inform.'' Propagandieren -- to propagandize -- is closely associated with the verb ``to teach.'' The concept of organisieren -- to organize -- is a bit more complex and can be set aside for a moment. The remaining two roles, information and education, appear to have been accepted worldwide. Everyone speaks of information and education as among the roles of the press. Sometimes, in fact, those two roles are telescoped into one. The question arises as to whether one can clearly differentiate between information and education. In the United States, the difference is murky: one man's information is another man's education. Perhaps the distinction can be seen in the often-heard advice to put ``the news on the news page and editorials on the editorial page.'' Thus, news would be information and editorials would be education. Perhaps not; the difference is obscure. French press theoreticians, on the other hand, distinguish clearly between the two, in this case adhering closely to Lenin's model. The word ``collective'' ought not to pose a large problem if defined as that which is assembled or accumulated into a whole. By adding ``collective'' to Liebknecht's definition, Lenin characterized the newspaper as providing information and education not to individuals as single units but to them as part of a whole, as a ``collection of individuals.'' American journalists similarly see their audiences as collective, as groups of individuals.

At the Moscow State University School of Journalism, as at the other 22 journalism schools in the Soviet Union, the Leninist role model for the journalist is carefully taught, and collective agitation is defined as ``presenting information on everyday events.'' This definition is from Yassen Zassurskiy, dean of the Moscow school. To Zassurskiy, information must provide for the objective needs of the reader. ``Any information or commentary contributes to behavior and actions,'' he says. The first role is simply to supply information;

the behavior and actions are generated under the third role, that of ``collective organizer.'' Zassurskiy maintains that the capitalist model insists not only on supplying information about events but also about what is for sale in the market -- advertisements. Readers are lured into buying newspapers for news but are in fact given information about what they don't need: unnecessary products and useless gossip. Soviet theoreticians teach that there are two different types of information: primary and secondary. The primary deals with information that meets needs; the secondary deals with unnecessary material: advertisements, gossip, entertainment. Both types fall into the category of collective agitation. To Vladimir Hudec, dean of the Journalism School at The University of Prague, the information role properly calls for ``disseminating positive experiences and criticism of everything that hinders society in its development.'' If the language is carefully examined, without emotionally charged political reactions, one can see much similarity in the goals in the Marxist and capitalist models as taught at journalism schools. The press in each system is designed to criticize all aberrations and work for the good of society executing what is known as ``social responsibility.'' Indeed, one can find a parallel in capitalist press analysis with the socialist primary and secondary types of information: Primary is that which the reader needs to know in order to carry out his democratic duties; secondary is information he wants out of curiosity or a desire to be entertained. Such secondary functions, Soviet journalists are taught, involve artificial needs as opposed to objective needs, which are defined as food, clothing, housing, and essentials. ``There is,'' Zassurskiy says, ``a relationship between needs and interests.''

The second role, ``collective propagandist,'' presents few problems. To Zasurskiy, it involves ``explanation of the mechanics of the work of society, and of the reasons for events.'' In addition, it

provides ``timely interpretation.'' There is little difference between this role in the Marxist model and the persuasion role in the capitalist system: the writing of editorials, leading articles, and columns.

More complex is the role of the press as ``collective organizer.'' To Marx and Lenin, and to all who would change the social order, the press is a vehicle for manipulating public opinion and to stir the public to action. Zassurskiy characterizes the goal as ``to mold one's views and thus to modify behavior.'' He cites the weather report as an elementary example: Information about an impending rainstorm will cause readers to carry umbrellas. ``We are talking about a direct appeal to action,'' he says.

Organization is the centerpiece of Marxist-Leninist society. In this situation, the press and the public become one. As Hudec put it, ``A collective organizing function is characteristic for progressive journalism which develops in a broad way for the popular masses.''

In the United States and in other capitalist countries, the news media are among other things instruments of profit, and journalism school curricula regularly include courses in advertising, which is portrayed as safeguarding a free press independent of government control. The financing agent in the Soviet Union is either a unit of government or the Communist Party. In the U.S.S.R., there is no doubt in anyone's mind that newspapers, magazines, and broadcasting outlets are required to operate within the boundaries fixed by the Party. Journalism students in the Soviet orbit are instructed to present information ``objectively'' that will work to the end of benefitting society. To present contrary information is to serve reactionary interests and is thus unacceptable. In this case, the goals of the paymaster are carried out by the piper whose tunes are played in the interests of his paymaster. While no attention is paid to the

financing of the Soviet press in Marxist schools of journalism, it is taught that capitalist journalists serve the interests of their paymasters. The instruction holds that fairness and balance are mere pretenses and that objectivity is possible only under the banner of Marxism-Leninism.

While American-style journalism education has never been accepted as appropriately academic by the universities of Western Europe, it has been making inroads. Today, most European universities provide some lectures and/or seminars in communications. The emphasis is on research, with little or no training in basic skills. Those skills are taught in Western Europe at private schools or at polytechnic institutes. England has for instance been increasing its journalism skills training programs at polytechnic institutes. So has West Germany. Indeed at least two German universities have been experimenting with seminars on writing skills I have been asked to help develop one of those. To U.S. journalism professors, it sounds strange -- and almost heavenly -- to speak, as this university did, of a seminar devoted to having each student prepare in a semester one -- count it -- one story! More common in German universities is the inclusion of courses -- they don't call them that, however -- in communications in faculties of philosophy, or psychology, or pedagogy.

As far as I have been able to learn, the very first programs of journalism instruction at universities took place in Britain as far back as 1850 or so. By today's standards, these were curious patterns of instruction. Some universities, such as the one at Birmingham, tried in the 19th and early 20th centuries to make journalism training stick, but it was an off and on proposition, and never provided much hands-on practice. More intriguing was the ``training'' -- I put that word inside quotation marks --- at Balliol College at Oxford University, which became a place for aspiring young newsmen (never of

course newswomen). Only lofty and daring young men considered journalism a career in the 1850s when Balliol became famous as a launching-pad (an historical anachronism) for journalists. The idea was that young men would learn the world at the feet of distinguished scholars in the classics. They would chat with the Great Men as they took their afternoon constitutionals walking along the banks of canals, commenting during a pause on the showy, splashy colors of the flowers, while examining the subleties of international politics. That was all they needed, it was said, to make a distinguished name for themselves on Fleet Street or in India's sunny climes.

After most of these lofty young men had died in the trenches in the first world war, Balliol College declined for a while and the more plebeian University of London began journalism training in the 1920s. There too, however, the training was not markedly practical. The students did take one seminar in something called ``Practical Journalism,'' styled a bit after the University of Missouri program, but that instruction was lost in a sea of required courses in English Literature, Politics, Principles of Criticism, and indeed a course titled ``Economic and Social Structure of Today.'' Among the lecturers in that course were such political figures as Hugh Gaitskell, later a huge success among the Fleet Street journalists he had lectured to at the University of London. Despite the University of London program, a Royal Commission on the Press, which was active in the years after World War Two at the same time as the Hutchins Commission here, condemned British journalism education as not providing enough training in writing and editing.

The development of journalists in France followed a similar pattern -- and as a result, the eyes of aspiring young journalists in the Asian and African colonies of Britain and France were turned to London and Paris as guideposts, at least during the colonial era and in

the early years of independence. More recently, however, they have been turning to the United States or the Soviet Union as a model.

Nevertheless, the most lasting influence Western Europe has had on journalism education in Asia and Africa has come from the BBC -- the British Broadcasting Corporation -- which still stands as a model for ``good'' radio and television not only in the former British colonies but almost everywhere. The BBC in fact has done a remarkable job of public relations -- and not only that: it has for more than 50 years now been running its own journalism education program.

In the politically charged atmosphere of the postwar power struggle between the United States and the Soviet Union, training of Third World journalists has become an important political objective. Both the Kremlin and the State Department has expended many milliions of rubles and dollars to this campaign but very likely neither has been as successful in influencing the aspirations of young Third World journalists as the BBC, which over the years has been strikingly successful in transferring a belief system about the nature and roles of the news media.

Over the years, the BBC has raised studied indifference to the level of art. BBC chieftains, and staffers too, have taken pride in their dispassionate treatment of the most dramatic and shocking news events; in this, they have consciously pursued the goal of public service broadcasting. Not theirs to influence the audience to one position or another, but simply to lay out for their listeners the ``facts'' and coolly rational explanations of the meaning of those facts.

All around the planet, the BBC has established a reputation as the most thorough and most objective of all reporters of international news, certainly among broadcasters if not among all journalists. In former British colonies of Asia and Africa, the reputation is

especially exalted, since in the revolutionary days in which the colonial powers were ousted, the BBC studiously avoided any kind of overt bias in its broadcasts. Moreover, the BBC standards have been reinforced in the advancing world by training and education. With positive support from the British government, the BBC has been providing training courses for broadcast journalists from the advancing world since 1951. Within the two decades that followed, more than 500 broadcasters attended the BBC course, half of them from Africa. In 1965, television training was added to the program, and in the first five years, 165 journalists attended television courses. These journalists then returned to their native lands prepared to reinforce the already popular BBC model. Even before the training courses were initiated in London, the BBC had been dispatching experts throughout the British Empire to assist those who were starting radio enterprises.

In the francophone colonial empire, the French conducted similar programs, bringing African broadcasters to Paris for training. The French Office of Radio Cooperation (l'Office de Cooperation Radiophonique) went the British one better, by taking direct charge of developing television in France's African territories and ultimately merging the new groups into the homeland French radio and television system. The French model is not unpopular in former French territories, but it has never enjoyed the immense prestige of the BBC. For one thing, it was not unknown in Africa that French broadcasting was far more tightly controlled by the government in Paris than was the BBC in London. Hence, the public service image of the BBC has never been matched by the French broadcasting system. The reputation of the BBC is high not only in Britain's former colonies but also in Western Europe, Japan, the United States, and even in the Soviet Union and China. One might say that over the years the BBC has been Britain's most valuable export, for not only has the BBC exported a particular

style of broadcasting but also a set of political and cultural values that have taken root all over the world.

Those African and Asian broadcast journalists who have studied in the United States have been exposed to a quite different model, that of commercial broadcasting. Few American radio or television journalists pattern themselves on the men and women of the BBC. To present the news in a cool, dispassionate manner is anathema. Conventional wisdom holds that audiences will switch dials to competitor stations if the news is not presented in dramatic fashion. To many journalism students and practitioners from the Third World, the American style seems more suitable, for it can be adapted more easily to political ends. On the other hand, the commercialization of American television dismays the journalists of the advancing world, who, following the BBC model with which they have long been familiar, concern themselves primarily with ``serious'' news and not gossip or frivolous information. What does fascinate and excite the students and journalists from the advancing world is the technical quality of American broadcasting (and of newspapers as well). To be able to make use of the technological innovations in their homeland would enable them, most are convinced, not only to provide more interesting broadcasts but also to bring greater stores of information to their audience and thus ultimately assist mightily in the modernization of their nation.

The American style journalism school has long attracted a great deal of attention in Latin America and in more recent years in Asia and Africa as well. In those schools, the American emphasis on ``nuts and bolts'' journalism has made a great deal of sense. Indeed, many of those who teach at these schools, institutes and universities have training at U.S. universities. Still, when they have returned home, they have found it extraordinarily difficult to emulate the American model. In Latin America, to be sure, they haven't tried too hard --

because in Latin America, even today it makes little sense to think of the press as non-political, as of course the folklore of the press maintains in the United States. In Asia and Africa, lack of resources has been the chief problem.

It is of course impossible to speak blithely of journalism education in the Third World. The 120 or so countries that make up the industrially backward world are by no means a monolith. Educational patterns vary even as the nations differ in terms of wealth and opportunity. A full-scale examination of the status of journalism education in the Third World has yet to be undertaken. We might, however, examine with profit the situation in one of those countries, Nigeria, the largest and most prosperous country in Black Africa.

In a recent survey of the staff of the ambitious News Agency of Nigeria -- NAN -- more than half the respondents reported that they had received university degrees, the great majority with majors in journalism. Indeed of the ten respondents with master's degrees, only one had not majored in journalism. Only a handful of the degrees were earned outside Nigeria, with the great majority having studied at the Nigerian Institute of Journalism or at the school of journalism at the University of Lagos. But the American influence was enormous nevertheless, for all the Nigerian schools were modeled on those of the United States, most of the texts were American, and many of the instructors had been trained in the United States.

Still, the journalism system in Nigeria is primitive, and the reporters trained in the American model find it next to impossible to function as they would like -- in the absence of reliable telephone and transportation systems. Indeed, the copy of the Nigerian News Agency is transmitted in mimeograph form by motorized dispatch riders. And the Nigerian system is far better financed than that of most other African countries. Moreover, the news agency, newspaper and

broadcasting journalists tend to deplore many aspects of the American journalism system they have installed. They would like to break out into new forms of journalism education and find themselves frustrated at being unable to do so, both for financial and political reasons. I had occasion recently to meet in Nigeria with journalism educators and the newsmen themselves.

At a conference in Ibadan, a city said to have a population of some four million, the tone of the speeches involved the sharpest kind of criticism of the influence of the American mass media, especially radio and television. The frustration was apparent in an address by Olufolaji Ajibola Fadeyibi, a lecturer in the faculty of Social Sciences at the University of Lagos.

Fadeyibi complained that Ibadan radio and television stations were presenting too many TV programs produced in Britain and the United States. He zeroed in on a British disco program with a ``London Soho background, sleazy foreground and many ill-fated misled Nigerian youths wriggling and contorting to foreign (precisely American) music -- in between frequent swigs at beer bottles right on camera.'' To knowing laughter and ringing applause, he went on to ask: ``In what way does this program educate our children, reflect our cultural heritage, and promote national unity?'' Fadeyibi preserved his corker for his finale:

> The conclusion is obvious. There is no need for us to perpetuate a situation as well as condemn it at the same time. If the Western nations won't talk about us, play our music and enlighten their audiences about our culture, then we have no business talking about them, playing their music and showing ``Kojak.'' By so doing,

> we'll be putting an end to our cultural genocide and communication neocolonialism. To expect the Western nations to facilitate the bidirectional flow of information is to expect a river to flow backwards. Surely no flow is better than free flow.

It is to be noted that this speech and this meeting took place in what may well be the most capitalistic country in Africa. Contempt for cultural penetration by the United States, Britain, and the rest of the capitalist world is universal throughout Africa, even where the expressed ideals of the ``free press'' of those countries was warmly endorsed. Over and over at that meeting, Thomas Jefferson was invoked as the liberty-loving political leader who extolled newspapers above government. Emulating Jefferson, Bode Oyewole, a leading radio journalist and chairman of the Ibadan chapter of the Nigerian Union of Journalists, pronounced the mission of the journalist to educate ``the society of which he is an integral part. The journalist is a mass educator. His role is as important if not more so than the role of the classroom teacher.''

There seems to be a clear line drawn between the cultural penetration of the entertainment programs on television and the influence of the capitalist values of news production. Yet Oyewole and his fellow journalists at Ibadan, and editors and reporters all over the Third World, do not seem to recognize how different the goals they are expressing as part of their belief system are from those in the ideological system they are themselves extolling. Few journalists in the United States would have endorsed this comment by Oyewole:

> So long as the journalist is aware of his responsibilities towards the community -- principally that of helping development -- so long as he realizes that his freedom has bearing on what is good for the society and as such is not freedom without limits, then the traditional mistrust will be dissolved, and government and journalism will become twin agents of socioeconomic progress.

The linkage of freedom and responsibility is a familiar theme in discussions of journalism but in the older capitalist nations, need for limits on freedom is rarely mentioned, and scarcely ever are journalists and government regarded as twin agents of anything, let alone socioeconomic progress. The idea of the press as an instrument of progress dates back to the earliest days of the modern news media, but progress was to be achieved through the spread of information to the citizenry. In other words, information was the business of the press; if progress occurred, that was all to the good, but the role of news was to inform, not in any way to act as an agent of social or economic change.

This indeed is the message of the American school of journalism. It is not, however, the message most African journalists, educators and political leaders would like to see delivered. To them, the training ought to emphasize not only nuts and bolts, not only general knowledge in the social sciences and humanities, but also a commitment to education -- and in that image, education has a frankly political ring.

Take the situation, for example, in another African country which I visited recently, Tanzania. Television is in a very primitive state in that country. In fact, Julius Nyerere, the socialist president of Tanzania, has banned the sale of television sets on the mainland of his

country, in an attempt to avoid what he considers the cultural imperialism of western television. But on the island of Zanzibar, a part of Tanzania, television programs are produced and broadcast. The people who put or the TV news programs see themselves primarily as educators. As such they are also censors, for they refuse to air any scenes of violence and are reluctant to show any foreign imports, news or otherwise, that might threaten the fabric of the indigenous culture -- a far cry from the ''free flow of information'' goal advanced by their counterparts in the United States and other western countries.

As for journalism education in Tanzania, well, the entire journalistic community in the country endorses the idea of a homegrown training program to upgrade the quality of journalism in the country. In Dar-es-Salaam, I found a small coterie of enthusiastic young men trying to build a school of journalism in a rickety building donated by the Salvation Army. Nearly half the 31 students had not seen a typewriter before enrolling in the school. Next to raising money to operate the school, the chief ambition of the directors was to go to a school of journalism in the United States to learn better how to train their students.

From Africa and from Asia and Latin America as well, students have been flooding into journalism schools in the United States, but many others have been traveling to the Soviet Union to study Marxist-Leninist interpretations of the press. What once was referred to as ''a battle for men's minds'' is to some extent today being waged among journalists of the Third World. The belief system that has become widespread through the Third World has pleased neither U.S. nor Soviet theorists. On the one hand, that belief system has endorsed the goals of objectivity, fairness, and balance so dear to U.S. press thinkers; but on the other hand, it has set great store on assigning the press the job of organizer of the thinking of the public, as the political

instrument prized by Soviet analysis.

Journalism education today is not merely a matter of training young men and women in the lore of the newspaper, the magazine and the broadcasting station. It is also an important element in world politics.

***

For a thorough analysis of the material presented in this paper, see the author's forthcoming book, AGENTS OF POWER: THE ROLE OF THE NEWS MEDIA IN HUMAN AFFAIRS (New York: Longman).